THE *NAME*
ALTAR,
OR
ΘΥΣΙΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ,
anciently given to the
HOLY TABLE.

A Common-place, or Theologicall Diſcourſe, in a Colledge Chappell, more then two years ſince.

BY
JOSEPH MEDE B. D. and Fellow of *Chriſts Colledge* in *Cambridge*.

LONDON,
Printed by *M. F.* for JOHN CLARK, and are to be ſold at his Shop under S. *Peters* Church in Cornhill.
MDCXLVIII.

b

GENTLE READER,

A Long Preface would not become a Treatise of so small a bulk. Only therefore, in a word or two, thou art desired to take notice, that this Discourse was a private Exercise delivered in a Colledge Chappel, above two full years since, and so before the present controversie about that subject, whereof it treats, was commenced by any publick writing: and therefore not to be suspected to aym at, or to have relation to any mans opinion or person since interessed therein.

That it was never intended for the publick view, but, as thou mayst easily perceive by the form it still carries unaltered, fitted properly to that private Auditory and time, wherein it was uttered. But when, by occasion of the late polemicks, it was copied out, to communicate to some friends, for their better resolution in the controverted point: it chanced to fall into

the hands of ſome, who ſo well liked it, as that they thought, the time of its compoſure eſpecially conſiderded, (which by way of caution was then prefixed in the front) it would, being made publick, conduce to peace, and ſetling of mens mindes, and judgements in this queſtion.

The hope of ſo deſireable a good prevailed with the Author (otherwiſe the moſt unwilling of any man to come abroad) to permit it to the Preſſe. For whom would it not grieve to ſee, that the very NAME of That, the approach whereunto, was wont, and ſtill ſhould, diſſolve all differences, ſhould now become the occaſion of ſo much quarrell? Matth. 5.

Thus much I thought good to admoniſh thee: and ſo hoping thou wilt make a favourable and candide conſtruction of what is preſented unto thee, with no ill meaning (I dare aſſure thee) I bid thee Farewell.

Of the Name *ALTAR*, OR ΘΥΣΙΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ, anciently given to the HOLY TABLE.

✠

A Chappell Common-place. An. 1635.

Section I.

HAving made so long a Tractation about the Eucharist or Christian sacrifice, I hold it not unfit, before I passe to another Theme, to speak somewhat of the seat or raised fabrick whereon this holy mystery hath been celebrated as an appendix to my former discourses thereof: And the rather, because some questions and scruples are moved thereabout. And though others commonly pronounce of these things according to vulgar opinion and hear-say, without further search and enquiry; yet it becomes not us, who live in the Schools of the Prophets to do so; but to give our verdict, when we do

Sect. 1.

do give it, out of judgement and due examination.

To come then to the matter; The ſeat or raiſed fabrick, appointed for the ſetting and celebration of this holy myſterie, was The HOLY TABLE or ALTAR: for by both theſe names hath that ſacred *Biere* (as I may call it) of the body and blood of Chriſt been ever promiſcuouſly and indifferently called in the Church. Of the name TABLE there is no queſtion; it is granted by all: But concerning the name ΘΥΣΙΑΣΤΗ'ΡΙΟΝ or ALTAR, many will not beleeve it. Let us therefore ſee, what may be alledged for the antiquity of the uſe of it, as well as of that of TABLE. And take notice, that I ſpeak not here, either of the matter or form (wherewith men are wont to entangle this queſtion) but of the *name* and *notion* onely, whatſoever the form or matter were.

Tertullian An. 200.

I will begin with *Tertullian*, the moſt ancient of the Latine Fathers now extant, who flouriſhed about 100. years after the death of S. *John* the Euangeliſt, and 200. after the birth of Chriſt. He in his book *De oratione, in fine*, reprehending their ſcrupulosity, who thought it not ſo lawfull to partake the Euchariſt upon their *ſtation* or weekly faſt-dayes, leſt their faſt thereby ſhould be diſſolved, expreſſes himſelf after this manner.

See alſo c. 10.

«*Similiter de ſtationum diebus*, (ſaith he) *non putant pleriq; ſacrificiorum orationibus interveniendum, quòd ſtatio ſolvenda ſit accepto corpore Domini. Ergo devotum Deo obſequium Euchariſtia reſolvit, an magis Deo obligat? Nonne ſolennior erit ſtatio tua, ſi & ad* ARAM *Dei ſteteris? Accepto corpore Domini*

« *mini & reſervato, utrumque ſalvum eſt, & partici-* Sect. 1.
« *patio ſacrificii, & executio officii.*

Again, in his *De exhortatione caſtitatis*, *c.* 10. endeavouring to prove (though erroneouſly) that a ſoul conſcious of the act of the mariage bed, could not be fit for the duties of prayer and devotion, he ſpeaks thus; « *Si ſpiritus reus apud ſe ſit, & conſcientia eru-* 2
« *beſcit, quomodo audebit orationem dicere ad Altare?*

Theſe two places ſhew, that in *Tertullians* time, as the name *ſacrifice* was uſed for the Euchariſt; ſo was that of ALTAR for the HOLY TABLE: Beſides that, the prayers of the Church uſed there to be offered up unto God. 1 2

Within 50. years after *Tertullian* lived St *Cyprian*, BP of the ſame Church, where *Tertullian* was Preſbyter: To whom this language was ſo familiar, that I have obſerved it ten times at leaſt in his Epiſtles onely: but whether he ever uſeth the name TABLE, I know not. I will recite onely 5. or 6. of the moſt pregnant and evident places, and not eaſie to be eluded. *Cyprian. An.* 250. -

And firſt, that in his XLII. Epiſt. or 2. *Ad Cornelium*; where, to ſhew, that he favoured his part againſt *Novatianus*, at the beginning, though he was not fully enformed then of the lawfulneſſe of his election; he relates, That, having read his letters in the Church aſſembly, he refuſed to publiſh thoſe Libellous criminations againſt him, which *Novatianus* had ſent by his meſſengers to be there read. « *Hono-* 1
« *ris* (ſaith he) *communis memores, & gravitatis ſacer-*
« *dotalis ac ſanctitatis reſpectum tenentes, ea quæ ex*
« *diverſo in librum ad nos tranſmiſſum congeſta fue-*

Sect. 1. « rant, acerbationibus criminoſis, reſpuimus; conſide-
« rantes pariter & ponderantes, quòd in tanto fratrum,
« religioſoque conventu, conſidentibus Dei ſacerdotibus,
« & ALTARI POSITO, nec legi debeant, nec au-
« diri? Tis a deſcription or periphraſis of an Eccleſiaſticall aſſembly, or, as he calls it, *religioſus conventus*.

2 Likewiſe in his LV. Epiſt. where declaming againſt ſome lapſed Chriſtians, who in time of perſecution having ſacrificed unto Idols, were yet ſo proud and inſolent, as to endeavour by threats and violence to be received again into the Church, without undergoing publique penance, and the ſatisfaction accuſtomed; he ſpeaks on this manner: If ſuch inſolency as this be tolerated, and thoſe who ſacrifice unto Idols, once come to be received again into the Church, without due ſatisfaction; « *Quid ſupereſt,*
« *quàm ut Eccleſia Capitolio cedat, & recedentibus ſa-*
« *cerdotibus, ac Domini noſtri* ALTARE *removenti-*
« *bus, in Cleri noſtri ſacrum venerandumque* CON-
« SESSUM * (i. e. in Presbyterium, ſeu τὸ ἅγιον βῆμα)
« *ſimulachra atque Idola cum* ARIS *ſuis tranſeant?*

* *Conſeſſus* here notes the place as in Gr. Συνέδριον.

3 Again, in his LXIV. Ep. againſt one *Fortunatianus* a Biſhop, who having lapſed in the time of perſetion, would nevertheleſſe return to the office of a Biſhop, he hath theſe words: « *Cum debeat ſatisfa-*
« *cere & ad Dominum exorandum diebus ac noctibus,*
« *lachrymis & orationibus & precibus incumbere; au-*
« *det ſibi adhuc ſacerdotium, quod prodidit, vindicare,*
« *quaſi poſt* ARAS *Diaboli accedere ad* ALTARE
« *Dei fas ſit.* And in the ſame Ep. *Ne tales ad* AL-
« TARIS *impiamenta & contagia fratrum denuo re-*
deant,

Sect. 1.

" *deant, omnibus viribus excubandum eſt.* In theſe two laſt places note, 1. The name ALTAR uſed for the HOLY TABLE. 2. That thoſe Fathers, when they would diſtinguiſh between the ALTAR of the true God, and the ALTARS of Idols, do uſually call the one ARA, and the other ALTARE; of which more hereafter. 1 2

A fourth teſtimony is to be found in his LXX. Epiſtle *ad Januar. & cæteros*, where to prove that Heretikes cannot give true Baptiſm, he reaſons thus; 4
" *Porro autem* (ſaith he) *Euchariſtia, & unde Baptiza-*
" *ti unguntur, oleum, in* ALTARI *ſanctificatur.*
" *Sanctificare autem non potuit olei creaturam, qui nec*
" ALTARE *habuit nec Eccleſiam. Vnde nec unctio*
" *ſpiritalis apud Hæreticos poteſt eſſe, quando conſtet,*
" *oleum ſanctificari, & Euchariſtiam fieri apud illos*
" *omnino non poſſe.*

A fift teſtimony of this uſe of ſpeech we may have in his LXIII. Epiſt. *Ad Cæcilium*, where he ſaith, 5
" *Sed & per Salomonem Spiritus ſanctus typum Domi-*
" *nici ſacrificii ante præmonſtrat, immolatæ hoſtiæ, &*
" *panis & vini; ſed &* ALTARIS, *& Apoſtolorum*
" *facieus mentionem, Sapientia, inquit, ædificavit ſi-*
" *bi domum, & ſubdidit columnas ſeptem, mactavit ſu-*
" *as hoſtias, miſcuit in cratera vinum ſuum, & para-*
" *vit menſam ſuam, & miſit ſervos ſuos, convocans*
" *cum excelſa prædicatione ad crateram, dicens, &c.*

A like paſſage whereto is to be found alſo in his 6
Teſtimoniorum adverſus Iudæos, Lib. 2. c. 2. " *Quod*
" *ſapientia Dei Chriſtus, & de Sacramento incarnatio-*
" *nis ejus, & paßionis & calicis, &* ALTARIS, *&*
" *Apoſtolorum qui miſſi prædicaverunt* [Teſtimonium

 " extat]

Sect. 1.

"extat] *apud Salomonem in paræmiis: Sapientia adi-*
"*ficavit sibi domum, & subdidit columnas septem, ma-*
"*ctavit hostias suas, miscuit in cratera vinum suum, &*
"*paravit suam mensam, &c.*

By which two passages it appears, that the name *Altar* was so familiarly and ordinarily used of the *Holy Table* in his time, that he interprets *Solomons* * *Mensa* by that name, *tanquam per notius*, as by the better known. Otherwise what need he have expounded *Solomons mensa* by *Altare Christi*? *Mensa Christi* would have served the turn. I have deduced these testimonies of *Cyprian* the more at large, because of those objections wont to be alledged out of *Arnobius* to the contrary, who notwithstanding lived 50. years after him. And out of *Lactantius*, who being Tutor to *Constantines* son *Crispus*, was yonger then he.

* As *Athanasius* likewise doth *Disp. cont. Arrium in Con. Nic. p.* 30. *To.* 1. τράπεζαν, τουτέστι (in quit) τὸ ἅγιον Θυσιαστήριον, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἄρτον οὐρανιον καὶ ἄφθαρτον.

Zeno Veronensis. An. 260.

Not long after *Cyprian*, about the year 260. lived *Zeno Veronensis*, as appears by himself in his book *De Continentiâ*. *Casaubon* cals him *Scriptor vetustissimus & elegantissimus*. This Author in the 9. of his Paschal Sermons *Ad Neophytos*, *Invitatione* ad *Fontem tertia*, sayes of the Church, then a child-bearing mother unto God of many sons by Baptism, that she brought forth far cleaner children, then a naturall Mother useth to do, being her self *non fœtidis cunis*, "*sed suave redolentibus* SACRI ALTARIS *fæ-*
"*liciter enutrita cancellis*. Here it is not onely ALTARE, but ALTARIS *cancelli*, the septs whereby it was separated from the rest of the Church, or place of sacred assembly.

Euseb.

And for the dayes of *Constantine* (whose raign began some 50. years after) *Eusebius* hath left us a copy of

of a panegyrick Oration made at the dedication of a sumptuous and magnificent Church at *Tyre*: the structure and garnishing whereof the Panegyrist describing at large, and amongst the rest, the seats erected in the *Sacrarium* or Quire, for the honour (as he speaks) τῶν προέδρων, of the Prelacy, and Priestly Order, he adds, "Καὶ τὸ ἅγιον ἁγίων ΘΥΣΙΑΣΤΗ'ΡΙΟΝ ὂν "μέσῳ θεὶς, *& sacrosancto* ALTARI *in medio collo-* "*cato; ista rursus,* [ἃς ἂν εἴη τοῖς πολλοῖς ἄβατα] *ut à mul-* "*titudinis accessu prohiberentur,* τοῖς ἀπὸ ξύλου περιέφραττε "δικτύοις, *reticulati operis cancellis ex ligno fabricatis* "*cieundedit, adeò ad summum solertis artificii elabora-* "*tis, ut mirabile intuentibus præbeat spectaculum.* "Lo here again, ALTARI, and *cancelli ejus.*

But the same *Eusebius* in his book *De laudibus Constantini, versus finem*, hath a more full passage, and which shewes this language to have been at that time common and usuall. For there, magnifying and setting forth the stupendious and unparalleled power of Christ our Lord and Saviour, testified abundantly by that wonderfull and never before exemplified change, which he had then wrought in the world; amongst other instances he hath this passage; "*Quis* "*alius, solo Servatore nostro excepto, coëpulonibus suis* "*incruenta & rationalia sacrificia precibus & arcanâ* "Θεολογίᾳ *peragenda, tradidit? Quorum causâ tum* "ALTARIA *in toto terrarum orbe constituta sunt,* "*tum Ecclesiarum dedicationes factæ: solique omni-* "*um moderatori Deo, divina sacrificiorum, sola mente* "*& ratione obeundorum, ministeria ab omnibus genti-* "*bus exhibita; sacrificia verò sanguine, cruore, & fu-* "*mo peragi solita--vi quadam occulta & invisibili, de-*

Sect. 1.

Gr. ἐπὶ τῆς καθ' ὅλης οἰκουμένης ἀθρώπων Θυσιαστήρια συνέστη' Ἐκκλησιῶν τε ἀφιερώματα

Sect. 1.

"leta & extincta ſunt. Lo here ALTARIA *in toto* "*terrarum orbe conſtituta*, for the offering of the "Chriſtian ſacrifice.

In Demon. adv. Iudæos & Gent. Ὅτι θεὸς ὁ Χριστός. *Edit. Sav. Tom. 6. p. 635.*

Where I thought not good to omit, that what *Euſebius* ſpeaks here of the world in generall, St *Chryſoſtome* affirms in particular of our Britiſh Ilands; "Καὶ γὰρ (ſaith he) αἱ Βρεταννικαὶ νῆσοι, αἱ τ θαλάττης ἐκτὸς κεί-"μεναι ταύτης, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ὄσαι τῷ Ωκεανῷ, τ δυνάμεως τ ῥήματος "ἔσχοντο· καὶ γὰρ κἀκεῖ Ἐκκλησίαι καὶ ΘΥΣΙΑΣΤΗΡΙΑ πεπή-"γασιν. *The Britiſh Ilands, which lie out of this ſea, and* "*are in the Ocean it ſelf, have felt the power of the* "*Word: for even there alſo Churches and* ALTARS "*are erected.*

SECT.

Sect. 2.

Section II.

BUT will ſome ſay, Tis true indeed, that from 200. years after Chriſt, and förward, the name of Altar was much frequented, but before that time it cannot be ſhewed to have been uſed by the teſtimony of any Authentique writer; and therefore nothing ſo ancient as that of Table. So ſome of ours affirm indeed; but they will be tryed by no other Authors, and records of thoſe times, then ſuch onely as themſelves hold for genuine, as *Iuſtin Martyr*, *Theophilus Antiochenus*, *Irenæus*, or it may be another ſmall Tractator or two(with whom this name is not found.) Of whom the works of the two principall, *Iuſtin* and *Iren.* the moſt likely to have enformed us, are neer the one half periſhed.

But before I make further anſwer to this exception, I would know, to what end it is made, and what advantage the Authors thereof do hope to gain by it. For the reaſon, I think why the name Altar is ſo much ſcrupled at, is, becauſe it is thought to imply *ſacrifice*. But *Iuſtin Martyr* and *Irenæus* are well enough known, to call the Euchariſt both an *oblation* and *ſacrifice*: yea the latter to dwell upon that theme. What gain is there then, that the name Altar is not to be found in thoſe works of theirs, which remain, if that of *oblation* and *ſacrifice* (for which the name

Sect. 2.

name of ALTAR is disliked) be? Besides, what likelihood, that those who conceived of the Eucharist under the notion of a Sacrifice, should not call the place thereof, as well as their Successors did, ΘΥΣΙΑΣΤΗ'ΡΙΟΝ?

Secondly, I would know of the Authors and users of this exception, whether in those Writers and Fathers before the 200. year after Christ, which they acknowledged for genuine, the name of TABLE be to be found, or not, given to that, whereon the holy *Eucharist* was celebrated. If it be not, then this exception of 200. years after Christ, (which yet is but 100. after the Apostles) makes no more against the one, then the other, if neither be to be found in the works extant of the Fathers, which then lived. For by this it will appear, they had no occasion to mention this sacred BOARD either by one name or other in those works of theirs which are left unto us. Now for my part, though I have with diligence sought to inform my self herein, yet hitherto it hath never been my hap to finde the Name of TABLE in any of them more then of ALTAR. I have enquired of others, and yet they have not shewed it me. And therefore till I see it, I will beleeve it cannot be shewn.

But perhaps you will say, What matters it, whether the Fathers, we speak of, have it, or not, if the Scripture hath? For doth not Saint *Paul* say, "*You* "*cannot be partakers of the Table of the Lord, and of the* "*Table of Devils?* Tis true. There is this onely place to be alledged to that purpose: I know no other. And yet this too, if the judgement of some of our

our own Expoſitors be taken, is not ſufficient to prove it neither. For *Table* here might ſignifie, not the inſtrument or ſeat, but the *Epulum*, or meat it ſelf; it being the uſe of all Languages (I am ſure of thoſe learned ones) to expreſſe diet by *Table*; yea whether it be ſet thereon, or not. And the matter of the Apoſtles diſcourſe ſeems to require this ſenſe: For he ſpeaks of *Idolothyta*, or *meats ſacrificed to Idols*. And not to be out-vyed with Antiquity, I could likewiſe (as ſome do) parallel this place for TABLE, with another, of a much like nature, for the name ALTAR; namely, that *Heb.*13. where the Apoſtle ſaith, *We* (i. e. we Chriſtians) *have an* ALTAR, *whereof they have no right to eat which ſerve at the Tabernacle.* I know what you would be ready to except; namely, That by the ALTAR here named, is meant Chriſt, which I for my own part ſhould willingly admit, ſo it be underſtood with this caution; Chriſt as he is to be eaten in the Euchariſt. For the Apoſtle ſpeaks here of an ALTAR to be eaten of; which is not the materiall inſtrument, or ſeat, but the ſacrifice uſed thereon. Thus if theſe two places, capable of, if not requiring the like interpretation, be ſet the one againſt the other, we have not all this while found one jot more for the Antiquity of the name TABLE then of ALTAR. Sect. 2.

But now to anſwer more directly to the Queſtion, Whether the name of ALTAR were uſed in the Church before 200. years after Chriſt or not? I anſwer, It was. For proof whereof, why may I not alledge the *Canons* called the Apoſtles? Which though the Apoſtles compiled not, yet are more ancient ſure *Canones Apoſt.*

Sect. 2. (at leaſt many of them) then 200. years after Chriſt, being not improbably to be thought to have been the *Codex Canonum*, whereby the Church in thoſe firſt ages (eſpecially of the Orient) was ordered and governed. And in Queſtions of uſe and cuſtome (ſuch as this is) not genuineneſſe of Titles onely, but whatſoever Antiquity, though masked under a wrong and untrue name, may be admitted, I think, to give evidence according to the age thereof. Beſides, if it be credible, that the Apoſtles, or thoſe to whom they committed the Churches, Apoſtolicall men, might leave unto the Church ſome rules of Order and Diſcipline, beſides thoſe mentioned in Scripture, (and whence otherwiſe ſhould thoſe Catholique and generally received traditions of the Church be derived?) why may not ſome of theſe, which bear that name, be of that number? And if any be, then none more likely then thoſe which are firſt in order: namely, becauſe collections of this nature are wont in proceſſe of time like ſnow-bals to receive increaſe by new additions ever and anon put unto them, and yet notwithſtanding continue ſtill the name and Title of their firſt Authors, though ſometimes not the one half of the contents will be owned by them. Upon which ſuppoſition we have, for the reſolving of the preſent queſtion, as much advantage as can be; conſidering, that the Canon we are to alledge, is the ſecond, or at the moſt (according as ſome others divide them) but the third in order from the beginning; and ſo (howſoever the collection hath in time been encreaſed) one of the firſt and moſt ancient of them. Let us therefore hear how it ſpeaks.

"CANON

"CANON APOST. II. *Si quis Episcopus aut* "*Presbyter præter Domini de sacrificio ordinationem* "[i. præter panem & vinum] *alia quædam* [ἐπὶ τὸ ΘΥ-"ΣΙΑΣΤΗ'ΡΙΟΝ] *ad* ALTARE *attulerit, sive mel,* "*sive lac, sive vini loco liceram studiosè confectam,* "*vel aves, vel animalia quævis (præter ordinationem)* "*deponatur. Præter* * *nova farra, aut Vvam tempore opportuno, non licitum esto aliud quid ad* ALTARE *(quàm oleum ad luminare, & incensum) tempore sanctæ Oblationis offerre.*

Sect. 2.

Here the name ΘΥΣΙΑΣΤΗ'ΡΙΟΝ or ALTAR is twice used for the HOLY TABLE. The latter part of the Canon the Greek hath thus: πλὴν νεῶν χίδρων, ἢ σταφυλῆς τῷ καιρῷ τῷ δέοντι, μὴ ἐξὸν ἔστω προσάγεσθαί τι ἕτερον πρὸς τὸ Θυσιαστήριον, ἢ ἔλαιον εἰς τὴν λυχνίαν καὶ θυμίαμα, τῷ καιρῷ τῆς ἁγίας προσφορᾶς. Where consider, whether it might not be read, ἢ ἔλαιον ἢ θυμίαμα, that is, *sive oleum ad luminare, sive incensum*: implying, that at another time they might be offered there, but not *tempore sanctæ Oblationis*, at the time of the holy Eucharist. For the better judgement whereof, and of the right meaning of the Canon (because the readings, distinction, and translations somewhat vary) take also a Canon of the Councell of *Carthage* under *Aurelius* (*Anno* 397.) very like unto it, and made undoubtedly in imitation thereof.

"SYN. CARTH. CAN. APUD BALSAM. "XL. *Non licere præter panem & vinum aqua mixtum, quidquam in sanctis mysteriis offerre: Ut nihil* "*amplius, quàm Corpus & Sanguis Domini offeratur,* "*quemadmodum Dominus ipse tradidit, hoc est, Panis* "*& vinum aqua mixtum. Primitiæ autem, sive mel,*

* Gr. χίδρα *tritici grana fricta aut tosta. Latini Graneas dixere. De significatione* τῶν χίδρων vid. LXX. Lev. 2.14.16. Et ca. 23, 14. Casau. in Athenæum lib. 14.16. *Male hic Balsamon et alii, Legumina.* Confer Can. Syn. Carthag. *quæ habet,* ἢ ἀπὸ σταφυλῶν καισίτου.

 "*sive*

Sect. 2.

"*sive lac, offerantur, ut moris est, uno die consueto, ad*
"*Infantium mysterium* (puta in Baptismo.) *Etsi enim*
"*maximè ad* ALTARE *offerantur, propriam tamen*
"*suam habeant benedictionem. Nihil autem amplius*
"*in primitiis* [nimirum ad Altare, in sanctis mysteri-
"is] *offeratur quàm ex Vvis & frumento.* Which one-
ly were permitted to be offered at the time of the
Eucharist (as may seem) because *Bread and Wine* are
made of them.

But I will not set my rest upon a Pseudepigraphall
Testimony, but alledge a witnesse past exception, and
for antiquity beyond them all. And that is, that holy
Ignat. Ep. Antioch. and blessed Martyr *Ignatius*, Bishop of that City,
where the name of Christians was first given to the
Disciples of Christ; who lived and saw the latter end
of the Apostles times. This blessed Martyr in those
Epistles of his (which none that are learned or judi-
cious now make question of) thrice useth the name
ΘΥΣΙΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ or ALTAR for the Lords
TABLE, in his Epistles *Ad Philadelphenses, Trallen-*
ses, & *Ephesios*. In the first whereof *Ad Philadelph.*
he speaks thus: "*Scribo ad vos, moneóque ut una fi-*
"*de, una prædicatione, una Eucharistia utamini: una*
"*enim est caro Domini nostri Iesu Christi, unus illius*
"*sanguis, qui pro nobis effusus est, unus item panis omni-*
"*bus confractus: & unus* CALIX, *qui omnibus dis-*
"*tributus est; unum* ALTARE *omni Ecclesiæ, & u-*
P. 233. Exer. 6. in Epist. Ad Ephesios. "*nus Episcopus cum Presbyterio, & Diaconis conservis*
"*meis.* In this place* *Vedelius* expressly acknowledgeth
the name ALTAR to be used by *Ignatius* for the
HOLY TABLE (though otherwise he be no friend
to that name) because he knew not how to elude it.

Sect. 2.

2

I thought good therefore to put it in the head of the file, to leade on the reſt which follow. Whereof

That *Ad Epheſios* ſhall have the next place; where exhorting them to be ſubject, and at unity with their Biſhop and Presbyterie, he enforceth it thus; "*Nemo erret*, (ſaith he) *niſi quis intra* ALTARE *ſit* "[Gr. ἐντὸς τοῦ ΘΥΣΙΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΥ] *privatur pane* "*Dei. Si enim unius aut alterius precatio tantarum vi-* "*rium ſit, ut Chriſtum inter illos ſtatuat, quanto plus* "*Epiſcopi & totius Eccleſiæ oratio conſona ad Deum a-* "*ſcendens* (for this uſed to be preſented at the *Altar*) "*exorabit, ut omnia quæ petiverint in Chriſto, dentur* "*ipſis?* As if he had ſaid, Be not deceived, but take notice, that as every one who is not at peace with his brother, is excluded from the *Altar*, [*Matt.* 5.] ſo much more, he that through diſobedience, is in ſchiſm and diſcord with his Biſhop and ſpirituall Fathers, is excluded thence; that is, hath no right to offer his gift thereat; & conſequently is deprived of the Bread of God (the holy Eucharist) and of the benefit of thoſe precious and efficacious prayers therewith offered up to God by the Biſhop and Prieſtly Order, in the name of the whole Church. Which, how great a benefit it is, may appear by this, That if the prayer of one or two be of that efficacie, as to place Chriſt in the midſt of them; how much more ſhall the united prayer of the Biſhop, and the whole Church be of force to prevail with the Divine Majeſty, to grant them all they ſhall ask in Chriſt's name? It follows, "*Quiſquis igitur ab his ſeparatur, neque concurrit cum* "βελῇ θυσιῶν, *& Eccleſia primogenitorum conſcripto-* "*rum in cœlis, Lupus eſt ſub ovina pelle faciem mentiens*

Sect. 2. "*manſuetam*: That is, An *Infidell* in *a Chriſtians coat*. Where by βυλῇ θυσιῶν, *Concilium* or *Senatus ſacrificiorum*, he underſtands the Biſhop and his Clergie, who are *Senatus rei Divinæ*, or *ſacris faciundis*. Therefore *Vedelius*, who will needs here, without reaſon or copy, in ſtead of βυλῇ θυσιῶν reade βυλῇ ὁσίων (the better to make way for his conceit, that the body of the Church in generall ſhould be the *Altar Ignatius* here ſpeaks of) did but correct the *Magnificat*, and pervert *Ignatius* his meaning, which he underſtood not. For that this which I have ſaid, is the meaning of *Ignatius* in this place, appears more plainly by the third teſtimony I am now to alledge of his, *viz.*

3 "*Ex Epiſt. Ad* TRALLENSES *ante med. Re-*
"*vereamini* (inquit) *Epiſcopum veſtrum ſicut Chriſtum,*
"*quemadmodum beati nobis præceperunt Apoſtoli. Qui*
"*intra* ALTARE *eſt, mundus eſt; quare & obtempe-*
"*rat Epiſcopo & Presbyteris. Qui verò extra eſt, hic*
"*eſt qui ſine Epiſcopo, Presbyteris & Diaconis quippi-*
"*am agit, & talis inquinatam habet conſcientiam, &*
"*Infideli deterior eſt.* 1. He is a woolf in a ſheeps skin, as he ſaid in the other Epiſtle. The places are twins, and the one is a gloſſe unto the other.

Now, by warrant of theſe teſtimonies, I think I may ſafely conclude, that the uſe of the name ΘΥΣΙΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ or ALTAR (for ought that any hitherto hath ſhewed to the contrary) is no leſſe ancient in Chriſtianity, then that of ἱερὰ τράπεζα of the Holy TABLE or TABLE of the Lord. And that both have been promiſcuouſly uſed from the Apoſtles times.

Nor is it any marvail it ſhould be ſo; for theſe

names

names are of an equivalent notion, and signifie one and the self same thing. For what is an *Altar*, but of those kinde of things we call *Tables*? whnt *Genus* else can we refer it to? The difference is, That an *Altar* notes not a common, but an *Holy Table*, a *Table* for an *Holy Feast*, such as I have heretofore shewed a Sacrifice to be, *Epulum ex oblatis*, or a Feast of an Oblation made unto God. That is, there is no more difference between a *Table* and an *Altar*, then between another cup and a Chalice. An *Altar* is not every *Table*, or a *Table* for a common feast, but an *Holy Table*, and an *Holy Table* is an *Altar*. The difference is not (as many suppose) either in the matter, as of wood or stone: For an *Altar* may be of wood (as both the golden *Altar*, and that of burnt offering were in the Tabernable, namely of Shittim wood) and a *Table* may be of stone: nor in the posture or manner of standing, whether in the middle, or against a wall; (for the *Altar* of burnt-offering stood in the midst of the Priests court, and the *Altar* of Incense up against the vail) but this is the true difference, that a *Table* is a common Name, and an *Altar* is an *Holy Table*. "*This Holy Altar* (saith *Gregory* "*Nyssene, Sermone de Baptismo*) *whereat we stand, is by* "*nature a common stone, nothing differing from other* "*slates; but being consecrated to the service of God, and* "*having received the benediction, it is* τράπεζα ἁγία, Θυ-"σιαστήριον ἄχραντον, an *Holy Table*, an *Altar inviolable*. See he makes one to be the *Exegesis* of the other. For in times past (when men perhaps were as wise, as we are now) it was thought fit and decent, that things set apart unto God, and sacred, should be distinguished,

Sect. 2.

Sect. 2.

ſhed, not onely in uſe, but in * name alſo from things common. For what is a *Temple* or *Church*, but an *Houſe?* Yet diſtinguiſhed in name from other Houſes. What is a *Sacrifice*, but a *Feaſt?* yet diſtinguiſhed in name from other Feaſts. So what is an *Altar*, but a *Table?* yet diſtinguiſhed in name from other Tables.

* Yea and in form and faſhion too. See *Maimon. apud Ainſ.* upon *Lev.* 19.30. For both ſanctity and ſanctification conſiſts in Diſcrimination.

Well; let all this be granted, may ſome man ſay, that there is no greater difference between theſe two names, then as you affirm; yet ought the language of the Church to be conformed to the ſtyle of the New Teſtament. But where in the New Teſtament ſhould thoſe Ancients finde any Text, whereon to ground the application of this name to the *Holy Table?* I anſwer, There, I am prone to beleeve, whence they derived the *Oblation* of the Bread and Wine in the Euchariſt, and that Rite of Reconciliation at their entrance thereunto; (where the Deacon was wont to proclaim Μή τις κατά τινος, *Ne quis contra aliquem*, or in ſome other words to like effect; and then every one to ſalute his brother in token of reconciliation and peace) and that was from that Ordinance of our bleſſed Saviour in his Sermon upon the Mount, viz. "*If thou bringeſt thy* GIFT *unto the* ALTAR, *and* "*there remembreſt that thy Brother hath ought againſt* "*thee, leave thy* GIFT *before the* ALTAR, *and go,* "*firſt be reconciled to thy Brother, and then come and* "*offer thy* GIFT. Which Scripture they took to be an Euangelicall conſtitution, wherein our Saviour implied, by way of Anticipation, that he would leave ſome Rite to his Church, in ſtead, and after the manner of the Sacrifices of the Law, which ſhould begin

begin with an Oblation, as they did; and that to require this proper and peculiar qualification in the Offerer, to be at peace, and without enmity with his brother: in so much as *Irenæus* seems to place that purity of the Euangelicall oblation, propheſied of by *Malachy*, even in this requiſite. *Vide l.4.c.34.* Hence also they may seem to have learned to call the Bread and Wine (in respect of this oblation) Ἅγια δῶρα the holy Gifts, from the word our Saviour here useth. Sect. 2. c.1.11.

For that they derived from this text that Rite of Peace and reconciliation before the Offertorie, appears expreſly out of *Conſtit. Apoſt.l.2.c.57. Iren.lib.4.34. Edit. Fevar. Tertull. De Oratione c.* 10. *Euſebius De vita Conſtantini, Lib.4.c.41. Cyril of Ieruſalem Catech Myſt.5.* Why then may I not beleeve as well, that they might derive from the same text the *Offertory* it self, and the application of the name *Altar* to the *Holy Table*, seeing all three in the Text depend one upon another; and that there is not in the New Testament any other passage of Scripture, whereon so ancient and universall a practice of the Church, as was in all these three particulars, could expreſly be grounded? And, besides that the primitive practice of the Catholique Church is a good rule to interpret Scripture by; there may be good reasons found, from the circumstances of the text, and Sermon it self, to perswade it to be an Euangelicall Conſtitution.

1. Because there was no such thing commanded in the Law to such as came to offer sacrifice; nor any such *deuteroſis* to be found amongst the traditions of the Elders. Now it is altogether improbable, our

Sect. 2. Saviour would then annex a new Rite to the Legall ſacrifices, when he was, ſo ſoon after, to aboliſh them by his ſacrifice upon the Croſſe; yea (if the Harmoniſts of the Goſpel are not deceived) within leſſe then two years after. For they place this Sermon between his ſecond and third Paſſeover. *Ergo* he intended it for an Ordinance of the Kingdom of God, (as the Scripture ſpeaks) that is, for the Church of his Goſpel.

2 2. Becauſe the Sermon, whereof this was part, is that famous Sermon of our Saviour upon the Mount; which he read as a Lecture to his Diſciples, to inſtruct them in the Myſteries of the Kingdom of God, a little before he ſent them out to preach; and ſo, in all likelyhood, contained the ſumme of that they were to preach; which no doubt was Doctrine Euangelicall. In all other parts of the Sermon we finde it ſo: wherefore then ſhould we not ſo eſteem it, even in this alſo?

3 3. Becauſe it is brought in (and that in the firſt place) as an exemplification of that righteouſneſſe, wherein the Citizens of the Kingdom of Chriſt were to outgo the righteouſneſſe of the Scribes and Phariſees: "*I ſay unto you* (ſaith our Saviour) *except your* "*righteouſneſſe ſhall exceed the righteouſneſſe of the* "*Scribes and Phariſees, ye ſhall not enter into the King-*"*dom of Heaven.* Then follows this text, ſhewing how far we are to outſtrip the Scribes and Phariſees, in our obedience to the precept, *Thou ſhalt not kill.*

4 4. This paſſage ſhould be Euangelicall, foraſmuch as it ſeems, together with the reſt that follow it, to be a part of that πλήρωσις or *complementum legis*, where-

whereof our Saviour ſpake a little before, ſaying, " *Think not that I am come to diſſolve the Law and the* " *Prophets*, (i. to aboliſh or abrogate the obſervation of them in my Kingdom) ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι, *but to accompliſh, ſupply or perfect them.* For this to be the meaning of that πληρῶσαι, the whole diſcourſe following it, ſeemeth to evince: wherein namely our Saviour puts in practice, and makes good *de facto*, in ſeveralll particulars, what he formerly ſaid, he came to do. Sect. 3.

Section III.

BUT there is one thing yet behinde, by no means to be forgotten in this Argument. That what I have hitherto ſpoken of the name *Altar*, is to be underſtood of Θυσιαστήριον, not of Βωμὸς. For theſe two are not the ſame. ΘΥΣΙΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ is the *Altar* of the true God; ΒΩΜΟΣ the *Altar* of an Idol. Wherefore the ancient Fathers and Chriſtians (which ſpake the Greek tongue) never uſed to call the *Altar* of Chriſt Βωμὸς, (though it were the uſuall word in that language) but ever Θυσιαστήριον. Which difference they learned out of the Greek Bible; in all which the *Altar* of the true God is * no where termed Βωμὸς, but alwayes Θυσιαστήριον. On the contrary, Βωμὸς never uſed (when it is uſed) but of an Idolatrous *Altar*, or Altar of an Idol. This difference of theſe two words may be evidently ſeen and confirmed by one paſſage in the firſt Book of *Maccabees*, *c.* 1. *v.* * 59. where concerning the Miniſters of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, who had erected an Altar to *Iupiter Olympius*, upon the great

* Except onely *Syracides*, and the 2. Book of *Maccab.* whoſe ſtyle gentiliſeth. * al. 62.

Sect. 3.

great brazen *Altar* in the Temple of the Lord, and sacrificed thereon, the Greek expresseth it in this manner: "Θυσιάζοντες ἦσαν ἐπὶ τὴν Βωμὸν ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ τοῦ Θυσιαστη-"ρίου, They sacrificed upon the Βωμὸς, which was up-"on the Θυσιαστήριον, which our Translation rightly renders, *They sacrificed upon the Idol-Altar, which was upon the Altar of God*; the circumstances of the place leading them thereunto. And that this testimony may not go alone, take with it a like expression or two in Saint *Chrysostom*, who in his 24. *Homil.* in 1. *Ad Corinthios*, brings in our Saviour thus speaking; Εἰ αἵματος ἐπιθυμεῖς, μὴ τὴν τῶν εἰδώλων Βωμὸν τῷ τῶν ἀλόγων φόνῳ, ἀλλὰ τὸ Θυσιαστήριον τὸ ἐμὸν τῷ ἐμῷ φοίνισσε αἵματι. If thou desirest bloud, make not the Idols Βωμὸς ruddy with the slaughter of Beasts, but my Θυσιαστήριον, with my blood. 'Tis upon that passage; "*The cup of blessing* "*which we blesse, is it not the communion of the blood* "*of Christ*: with the same style in the Homily a little before quoted [*demonstrat quod Christus sit Deus*] he magnifies the speedy propagation of the Gospel, that in so short a time Βωμοὶ καὶ ξόανα (*Bomoi & Simulacra*) were abolished, and Θυσιαστήρια were erected throughout the Roman Empire, yea among the *Persians*, *Scythians*, *Moores* and *Indians*. To all which adde another observation, That ΘΥΣΙΑΣΤΗ'ΡΙΟΝ is a word not used by any Pagan Writer, but is a meer Ecclesiasticall and Hellenisticall term, first devised, (as * *Philo* in his *Vita Mosis* would give us to understand) by the Septuagint to expresse the Hebrew word מזבח, and to distinguish the Altar of the God of Israel from the Altars of the Idol-gods of the Gentiles.

* *De vit. Mosis li.* 3. τὴν δὲ ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ Βωμὸν εἴωθε (*Moses nempe græcissans*) καλεῖν, τὸ Θυσιαστήριον.

But

Sect. 3.

But you will ask me now, wherein the reall difference between these two consisted, which made them so nice to call the one by the name of the other? Or was it verball onely? I answer, It was reall. For the *Altar* of the true God, Θυσιαστηριον, was onely (as the name implies) a *Table* for *sacrifice*; *viz.* in the law, of those bloody sacrifices which were then offered to God by fire and Incense: in the Gospel, of the reasonable and spirituall sacrifice, sent up unto God λόγῳ καὶ πνύματι onely by the word of thanksgiving and prayer. But Βωμὸς or the *Altars* of the Gentiles were *suggesta*, or *Scabella sculptilium & simulacrorum*; Idol-stools, or foot-stools of their Images, in respect of the accommodation the one had to the other; which was such, as their Idols were placed before, upon, or above their Altars. This may appear in some sort, by those passages of S. *Chrysostom*, which I now quoted; especially in the latter. And by that of Saint *Austin. Hom. 6. de verbis Domini*, where he proves from this posture, that the Gentiles took and worshipped their Idol-statues for gods, because they placed them *upon their Altars*. "*Nam illi* (inquit) "*quod Numen habeant & colant illam statuam, Ara te-*"*statur.* And this also the name Βωμὸς fitly intimates, as properly importing a *Basis*, whereon something standeth, *quasi* Βῆμα, of the word Βαίνω, as *Eustathius* notes; and accordingly used by *Homer* for the Bases, whereon stood the gilded statues of boyes holding lights at a banquet;

χρύσειοι δ' ἄρα χεῖρι ἐϋδμήτην ἐπὶ βωμὸν
ἕστασαν, αἰθομένας δαΐδας μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχοντες.

"So 2 *Chron.* 34.4. we reade, That *Iosiah caused the* "*Altars*

Mark here, who they are, that have turned the Christians Θυσιαστήριον into the Gentiles Βωμὸς.

Sect. 3.

"*Altars of Baalim to be broken down, and the Images* "*that were on high above them. Aaron* when he ſet up the *golden calf*, is ſaid in like manner to have *built an Altar before it, Exod.* 32.5. This connexion between the *Gentile-altars, and Idol-ſtatues* or Images, may alſo be gathered out of that fore-cited paſſage of S. *Cyprian, Epiſt.*55. where declaming againſt ſome lapſed Chriſtians, who having in time of perſecution ſacrificed unto Idols, would for all that, be admitted again into the Church, without due ſatisfaction; If this be ſuffered, (ſaith he) "*Quid ſupereſt, quàm ut* "ECCLESIA *Capitolio cedat, & recedentibus ſacer-* "*dotibus, ac Domini noſtri* ALTARE *removentibus* "*in Cleri noſtri ſacrum venerandumque conſeſſum* (i. "in ſacrarium noſtrum, ſeu* τὸ ἅγιον βῆμα) SIMU- "LACRA *atque* IDOLA *cum* ARIS *ſuis tranſeant?* In this not long paſſage are many things worthy obſerving. 1. *Eccleſia* uſed for the place of Holy aſſembly, and oppoſed to *Capitolium*, which ſtands here for any Gentile Temple. 2. The place of the *Clergie* next the *Altar*, and diſtinguiſhed from that of the Laity. 3. The coupling of *Simulacra* and *Idola cum Aris ſuis*, as *individui comites*, and the oppoſition thereof to *Altare Domini noſtri*, i. *Chriſti*. 4. That the Latine Fathers ſometimes imitated the Greek, in diſtinguiſhing as well as they could, the names of the *Altars* of Chriſt, and the *Altars* of Idols, calling Θυσιαστήριον ALTARE, and Βωμὸς ARA. Which the Author of the vulgar Latine ſo farre obſerves, that, throughout the canonicall Scripture, he never calls the *Altar* of the true God ARA, but the Altars of Idols onely, as the Septuagint uſeth the name Βωμὸς.

*Or, as this part of the Church is termed in a ſtory of the ſame time in Euſ. τὸ Ἁγίασμα the name whereby the LXX. call the Sanctuary in the Old Teſt. *Hiſt. Eccleſ. l.*7. *cap.*18. *de Marino* "*Martyre,* "*Addu-* "*ctum ad* "*Eccleſi-* "*am ſta-* "*tuit in-* "*tus pro-* "*pe τὸ Ἁ-* "*γίασμα.*

Sect. 3.

I have profecuted this obſervation of the difference between Θυσιαστήριον and Βωμὸς the more largely, becauſe it will help us through thoſe doubtfull and ſtumbling paſſages, which are found in *Origen*, *Minutius Felix*, *Arnobius* and *Lactantius*, in their diſputes againſt the Gentiles. Who although they lived, the two firſt in the 3. Century, (after *Tertull.*) the two latter about the beginning of the fourth *ſeculum*, in the dayes of *Dioclesian* and *Conſtantine*, 50. years after S. *Cyprian*: during all which time, it is apparent, confeſſed, and may be invincibly proved againſt ſuch as ſhall deny it, that Chriſtians had *Oratories* and *Houſes of worſhip* to perform the Rites of their Religion in; as alſo (by thoſe teſtimonies alledged) that they uſually called the HOLY TABLE there placed, by the name of ALTARE and ΘΥΣΙΑΣΤΗ'ΡΙΟΝ: yet theſe Authors afore-named, when the Gentiles object Atheiſm to the Chriſtians, as who had no *Temple*, no *Aræ*, no *Simulacra*, are wont in their Apologies to anſwer by way of Conceſſion; not onely, that they had none; but more, that they ought not to have. What ſhould this mean? why this: They anſwer the Gentiles according to the notion, wherein they objected this unto them: to wit, that they had no Βωμοὶ, no *Idol-ſtools*, or *Simulacrorum ſcabella*; not that they had no Θυσιαστήρια. Therefore the word which *Origen* there uſeth is Βωμοὶ. And in all thoſe paſſages you ſhall ever finde *Aræ* & *Simulacra* to go together. "*Origen*, Ὁ Κέλσος φησὶν ἡμᾶς Βωμῶν καὶ ἀγαλμάτων καὶ ναῶν ἱδρύσεις "φεύγειν· *Celſus ait, nos Aramum & ſtatuarum, Templo-*"*rumque fundationes fugere.* Minutius Felix. *Cur nul-*"*las Aras habent? Templa nulla? nulla nota ſimula-*"*cra?*

S ect. 3.

"*cra?* Arnob. *In hac consuêstis parte crimen nobis ma-*
"*ximum impietatis affigere-- Quod non Deorum alicujus*
"*simulacrum constituamus aut formam, non Altaria fa-*
"*bricemus,* * NON ARAS. Lactantius. *Quid sibi Tem-*
"*pla, quid Aræ volunt, quid denique ipsa simulacra, &c.*

And as for Temples, their meaning was, they had no such *claustra Numinum*, as the Gentiles supposed *Temples* to be, and to which they * appropriated that name; *viz.* Places, whereunto the gods, by the power of spels and magicall consecrations, were confined and limited; and, for the presencing of whom a statue was necessary; places wherein they dwelt, shut up as birds in a cage, or as the Devil confined within a circle, that so they might be ready at hand, when men had occasion to seek unto them: That Christians indeed had no such dwellings for their God as these; for that their *God dwelt not in Temples made with hands*: but not, that they had not [a] τόπους θρησκευσίμους, no [b] οἰκοὺς προσευκτηρίους, Κυριακὰ, or [c] Ἐκκλησίας. For such the stories and monuments of those times expresly inform us, they had; and the Gentiles themselves that objected this defect, knew it too well, as may appear by their Emperors Rescripts for demolishing them, and sometimes for restoring them, when the persecution ceased. All which he that will, may finde in *Eusebius* his Ecclesiasticall History, before either *Arnobius* or *Lanctantius* wrote. Whither I refer them that would be more fully satisfied; yea to *Arnobius* himself in the end of his 4. Book *adversus Gentes*, where he speaks of the burning of the Christians sacred Books, and demolition of their Places of assembly. And thus I conclude my Discourse.

FINIS.

* Perhaps he adds this by way of correction of his word *Altaria.*

* According to which stile S. *Hierome Ep. ad. Riparium* saith *de Iul. Apostat. Quod sanctorum* Basilicas *destruxerit, aut in* Templa *converterit. Ep.* 10.

[a] *Galienus in ed. ap. Eus. l.* 7. *c.* 17.

[b] *Apud eund. Hist. l.* 7. *c.* 1, 2.

[c] *Ibid. c.* 3.